

| | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/495,257 | WORRELL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Norca L. Torres-Velazquez | 1771 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Norca L. Torres-Velazquez. (3)_____.

(2) Sally Current. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 29 November 2001.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Applicant showed sample of their product.

Claim(s) discussed: 7 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nielsen and Muramoto et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argues that Nielsen is not an elastic fabric and that Nielsen's process is not compatible in the sanding of an elastic fabric. Applicant states that it is known to sand an elastic fabric but not to produce a sanded elastic fabric having low hairiness. The Muramoto reference does not discuss a sanded elastic fabric.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

09/495,257 Sanded elastic fabrics

- Applicants define elastic knit fabrics as knit fabrics incorporating elastic fibers, regardless of the manner in which they are knit. (defined on p.2 of the Spec)
- They use a microfinishing film on the roller of a conventional sanding or sueding machine to sand the fabric, it loosens the fibers in the yarn bundles without undesirably cutting them in the manner of conventional sandpaper. The purpose: to improve the hand of the fabric.
- Problem with conventional sanding methods: greater variation in fabric nap across the width of the fabric.

April 18, 2001

*discussion with Terrel Morris

Applicants had argued that the use of conventional sanding methods on elastic fabrics produces breakage causing the formation of a high amount of fuzz, increasing the hairiness values.

Nielsen – cuts the yarns in the fabric. Applicants argue that the Nielsen fabric would have high levels of hairiness because of the need for the vibration of the roll to knock loose fiber particles and the emphasis placed on fiber cutting.

**Terrel indicated that the processes to produce the fabric are equivalent. (Regarding Nielsen's art). There is no degree of abrasion set forth in the claim. Applicant's arguments cannot take the place of evidence. There is no evidence of record to verify it. No correlation between their finding and the comparative art of Nielsen.*

There is nothing in the claims to preclude the cutting of fibers.

Terrel found the hairiness arguments persuasive and suggested to ask attorney to include claim 8 into claim 7.

4/19/01: attorney didn't want to do that nor have claim 8 with the limitation of microfinishing film.

Interview with attorney November 29, 2001

Further, Applicants argue that Nielsen does not teach an elastic fabric. "It is known to sand an elastic fabric but not to produce a sanded elastic fabric having low hairiness. High hairiness causes problem of peeling.

Muramoto – there is no discussion of sanded elastic fabric.

During interview, attorney proposed to incorporate the definition of "elastic fabric" in the claim as defined in the specification.

*Attorney: Sally Clement
(804) 503-1594*